

**From:** [PETERSON Jenn L](#)  
**To:** [Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [Fwd: Re: Fw: 10x versus 100x DDX PECs]  
**Date:** 01/25/2007 10:41 AM

---

There are several PEC values listed in the 2000 McDonald PEC publication.

Sum DDD: 28.0  
Sum DDE: 31.3  
Sum DDT: 62.9  
Total DDTs: 572

I am not sure how these values are being applied at ARKEMA, but I think we should be meeting each of the isomer values as well. The total DDT value, based on the reliability analysis done in the paper, is higher effect number. The data used to develop the number may also be different that the data used to develop the others - esp. since it doesn't make sense with the other values. If you add the values for each of the sums you get 122.2, not 572.

-Jennifer

-----  
From: (b) (6)  
Sent:   
To: PETERSON Jenn L  
Subject: [Fwd: Re: Fw: 10x versus 100x DDX PECs]

=====  
From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov  
Date: 2007/01/25 Thu PM 12:06:49 CST  
To: Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov  
gov, humphrey.chip@epamail.epa.gov,  
(b) (6) metrix.com  
Subject: Re: Fw: 10x versus 100x DDX PECs

The 572 ug/kg is a MacDonald, et. al., PEC. See Table 3 of the January 2000 paper. The TEC of 5.28 ug/kg for total DDTs is also taken from this paper - see Table 2.

Eric

Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA /US		To
01/25/2007 09:36 AM	(b) (6), com	cc
	blischke.eric@epa.gov, humphrey.chip@epamail.epa.gov	Subject
	Fw: 10x versus 100x DDX PECs	

I am concerned about the values of 572 ug/kg PEC for the total. What did we decide yesterday? There is no total value in the JSCS table.  
----- Forwarded by Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US on 01/25/2007 09:32 AM -----

Charlie Wisdom <cwisdom@paramet rix.com>		To
01/24/2007 08:15 PM	ANDERSON.Jim@deg.state.or.us, cyril.alex@deg.state.or.us, gainer.tom@deg.state.or.us, mcclincy.matt@deg.state.or.us, peterson.jennifer@deg.state.or.us , poulsen.mike@deg.state.or.us, craig.christian@eiltld.net, jennifer.arthur@eiltld.net, jean.lee@envintl.com, Sean Sheldrake/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Rene Fuentes/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, greppo-grove.gina@epa.gov, Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Jim.Wright@noaa.gov, Robert.Neely@noaa.gov, awhittker@parametrix.com, Charlie Wisdom <cwisdom@parametrix.com>, Peter Battuello <pbattuello@parametrix.com>,	

Robert Gensemer  
<rgensemer@parametrix.com>, Scott  
Elkind <SElkind@parametrix.com>  
cc

Subject  
10x versus 100x DDX PECs

Team -

I have resolved the seeming contradiction between Arkema's RAA Boundary based on the DDX PECx10 contour line versus the Parametrix grid cell presentation.

1) Arkema and Parametrix used the same PEC values:

Chemical	MacDonald PEC or other SQV (ug/kg)
Total of 2,4' and 4,4'-DDD	28
Total of 2,4' and 4,4'-DDD, -DDE, -DDT	572
Total of 2,4' and 4,4'-DDE	31.3
Total of 2,4' and 4,4'-DDT	62.9

2) The difference is the result of presenting estimated concentrations using contour lines for PECx10 concentrations versus assigning the Pecx10 to a 50'x50' grid cell. The Arkema contouring technique assigned a bigger area to the value of PECx10, resulting a seemingly larger RAA Boundary than one drawn strictly around each filled grid cell.

3) Once Margaret has completed revising the grid cell figures for Chapter 6, her next task is developing isopleth figures for the 14 COI that had a maximum exceedance of 1000x their smallest SLV. This figure will essentially be the same as the PECx10 figure generated by Arkema (always considering that different contouring programs produce different contours from the same dataset).

Please let me know if you have any questions, comments, or concerns.

Charlie Wisdom  
Phone: 425-458-6233 direct  
Fax: 425-458-6363  
Cell: 425-256-1272  
cwisdom@parametrix.com

PARAMETRIX  
Inspired people - Inspired solutions - Making a difference